

TARIFF FACTS.

How Our Forty-seven Per Cent. War Tariff Affects the Toiling Masses.

What the Poor Washerwoman Pays for Sugar in the Cities of London and Paris.

A Republican Manufacturer Exposes the Sophistries of Protection and of the Chicago Platform.

Our Manufacturers Want Free Raw Materials, but Don't Dare to Say So.

The Tariff Views of Grant, Arthur, and Garfield—Where the Workingmen Stand.

Taxes for Rich and Poor.

There can be no more absolute proof of the fact that our 47 per cent. war tariff is framed in the interest of those who least need help and against the toiling masses, than a brief study of the rates of duty laid upon luxuries and necessities relatively. I herewith submit a table taken directly from the official tariff:

Tariff.	
Diamonds (unmet.)	Free
Jet	Free
Medals of gold and silver	Free
Fossils	Free
Fashion plates	Free
Precious stones	10 per cent
Agates	Free
Ottar of roses	Free
Almond oil	Free
Alabaster statuary	10 per cent
Sabre	Free
Turpentine	Free
Skele ones	Free
Suffed birds	Free
Fancy and perfumed soap	15 per cent
Cocos	Free
Cabinets of coins, medals, and other antiquities	Free
Brazil and coconut nuts	Free
Tropical fruit plants	Free
Tortoise shells	Free
Meerschaum	Free
Pantries	Free
Mother of pearl	Free
Regalia and gems for societies	Free
Quoits or curling stones	Free
Gut cord for musical instruments	Free
Ebony	Free
Lignum-vite	Free
Mahogany	Free
Satinwood	Free
Bosewood	Free
Cedar	Free
Boxwood	Free
Jewelry	Free
Raw silk	25 per cent
Antennettes	Free
Earthware and crockery	55 per cent
Slates and slate pencils	30 per cent
Handsaws	40 per cent
Pins	30 per cent
Sewing machine needles	35 per cent
Pocket knives and razors	50 per cent
Cream of tartar	6 cents per lb
Borax	5 cents per lb
White lead	3 cents per lb
House furniture	35 per cent
Mackintosh	1 cent per lb
Rice	25 cents per lb
Horseshoe nails	4 cents per lb
Hammers, wedges and crowbars	25 cents per lb
Hard, soft, and castile soap	20 per cent
Beeswax	20 per cent
Cast iron vessels and stove plates	14 cents per lb
Copper in plates and pigs	4 cents per lb
Matches	35 per cent
Ink	30 per cent
Garden seeds	20 per cent
Clay pipes	35 per cent
Books	20 per cent
Envelopes	25 per cent
Palm-leaf hats	30 per cent
Brooms	25 per cent
Buttons	25 per cent
Brushes	30 per cent
Leather gloves	50 per cent
Shingles	35 cents per 1,000
Pine clapboards	\$1 per 1,000 feet
Salt	12 cents per 100 lbs
Readymade clothing	40 per cent
Cotton thread and yarn	40 per cent
Clothing, hats, and shirts	40 per cent
Oilcloths	40 per cent
Hats and fanns	60 to 70 per cent
Women's dress goods, part wool	60 to 70 per cent
Women's shawls	60 to 80 per cent

How many diamonds, stuffed birds, cabinets of coins, snails, quoits, tortoise shells, and how much otter of roses, mother of pearl, rosewood and mahogany, meerschaum and jewelry, do the railroad laborer, mechanic and farmer have use for? Not a year passes but for their interest that these articles should be free of duty; or would they gain more by cheapening handaws, cream of tartar, rice, garden seeds, books, boards, hats, thread and clothing?—D. D. Jayne, in *Chenango (N. Y.) Union*.

The Protection Bugaboo.

A platform lecturer here an evening or two since on "The Footprints of Wesley," in speaking of his purchase from an English washerwoman of ships from the rock from which Wesley used to preach, and of his being told by her that the small sum received was more than she could get in England for a hard day's washing, brought out his continuing audience with the exclamation, "How glad I am to find that the man who gave me this lecture has the same spirit as I have!" whereas the lecturer and his hearers ought to have had the intelligence to know that the wages of English laborers, including English washwomen, are more than 50 per cent. higher in free trade Eng and, notwithstanding her denser population of over four hundred to a square mile, than in the high-protection country of continental Europe. The therefore, for the tariff is not the protection whatever of the higher wage rate of the American as compared with the English laborer, or the low wages of the English washwoman. Nay more, that the facts, if they prove anything, would show the tariff to be the cause of the lower wage rate in highly protected continental Europe, as compared with free-trade England, other conditions being vastly less dissimilar than between England and America, where its population even is but eight to ten times as large. One should know the condition of the English laboring class is vastly better now than under the high-tariff regime of forty years ago, in confirmation of which but read Miss Martineau's description of their condition at that time. And that the condition of work-women in free-trade London to-day is far better than in high-protectionist Paris will be seen from the following extract from Helen Campbell's correspondence on the needle-women of Paris. She writes:

"The average daily need is at the highest point, sugar alone being an illustration of what the determination to protect an industry has brought about. The London workwoman buys a pound for 1d., or at the most 2d. (2 cents and 4 cents). The French workwoman must give 11 or 12 sous (10 or 11 cents), and then have only beet sugar, which has not much over half the saccharine quality of cane sugar. Flour, meal, eggs, all are equally high, meat also being at nearly the same price as London. But is not the cost of living impossible, and fuel so dear that shivering is the law for all, but the rich, while rents are also beyond London prices. For the needlewoman the food question has resolved itself into bread alone for at least one meal, with a little coffee, chiefly chicory, and possibly some vegetables for the other. But many a one lives on bread for six days in a week, reserving the few sous that can be saved for a Sunday bit of meat or bones for soup."

And so on through a country as unfavorable to the manufacture of high-grade French goods as to the metropolis of that unfortunate (?) country in which prevails a "tariff for revenue only," and whose more highly paid laborers, strange as it may seem to the protectionist doctrinaire, find it unnecessary to demand protection from the low-paid or pauper wages of the competing nations of the continent. Strange, is it not, that American wages in the mind of your protectionist, need to be so highly protected,

when English wages need it not, although forced to compete with the low wages of the continent, at vastly greater disadvantage than America with England?

A French needle-woman and washerwoman pay sixpence a ton or eleven cents a pound for beet sugar when her English sister pays, but two or three cent for a superior article is a fair illustration of the logical fruitage, the selfish cupidity and blindness of that extreme protectionism gone mad, which even in the land of Bastiat and Turgot can thus sacrifice general interests on the altar of the special and protected interests of an unprofitable home industry, and that in America can fight to the bitter end against reduction of 5 per cent. on the necessary of life, as provided for in the Mills bill, or to reduce a dan erous surplus and to relieve the people from the burdens of unnecessary and unjust taxation; and that rather than surrender "any part" of its acquired ground, its usurped privileges, it would favor free or untaxed whisky and tobacco.—*Lakeside (Ohio) Cor. Chicago Times.*

The Manufacturers and the Tariff.

The following letter, written by a Republican manufacturer in New Haven, to the Chairman of the Finance Committee of a Republican club, shows that the sophistries of protection and of the Chicago platform have not mystified all the members of the g. o. p., even among the manufacturers:

OFFICE OF THE HADLEY COMPANY, BOSTON, July 13, 1883.

Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Holyoke Republican Club:

DEAR SIR—I have yours of the 12th asking for a report for the Republican club, and, of course, deeply interested in the tariff as regards the Hadley Company, and also in its bearing on many other cotton and woolen manufacturers in which I am interested; but, in my opinion, the Republican members of Congress from New England and the Home Market Club and the Woolen Manufacturers' Association have practically done more harm to the cause of protection and to the protected

United States, has wool on the free list. The position that the Republican party has taken makes it well for the country, as it seems to me, that it should not have the control of the Government for the next four years. Yours truly, ARTHUR T. LYMAN.

Free Raw Materials.

It was not until the Mills bill proposed to compete with the free wool and thus repeat a tax of 41 per cent. in the raw materials of our woolen manufacturers and reduce the tariff on woolens from 60 per cent. to 40 per cent. that the woolen manufacturers began to whisper the truth and the manufacturers of free wool from the limits of home consumption, living beyond the limits of home consumption in business, and therefore by a glutted domestic market, and affording their employees more certain and steady labor, with the resulting quiet and contentment.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD'S SPEECH IN THE HOUSE IN 1878.

I believe that we ought to seek that point of stable equilibrium somewhere between a prohibitory tariff on one hand and a tariff that gives no protection on the other. What's that point of equilibrium? In my judgment it is this: A rate so high that the manufacturers cannot flood our markets and break down our home manufacturers, but not so high as to keep them altogether out, enabling our manufacturers to combine and raise the prices, or so high as to stimulate an unwholesome growth of manufactures. In other words, I would have the duty so adjusted that every great American industry can fairly live and make fair profits; and yet so adjusted that if a manufacturer attempted to put prices unreasonably the competition from abroad would come in and bring down prices to a fair rate.

Where the Workingmen Stand.

Congressman Lawler, who voted against the Morrison bill two years ago, has been telling the Eastern people how he came to vote for the Mills bill. He says: "I have not heard one word of complaint from any of my constituents since the Mills bill was passed, and I have been in receipt of letters and telegrams from my constituents urging me to support it. In nearly every case these communications were sent by Knights of Labor and others who at one time believed that the prosperity depended upon a continuance of the existing tariff system."



(so-called) industries of Massachusetts than the Democratic party. I have had a number of conversations with the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, and to hear of the plans and views of others, and I am convinced that but for the action of the Republican members of Congress from New England and the greater part of the Republic, manufacturers of New England we could have had in the Mills bill satisfactory schedules for woolens and cottons. This is, at the request of some manufacturers (Republican), including Democratic members from Massachusetts, the Democratic and advanced rates and Means Committee substituted and advanced rates on some important items, while we were not informed, by Republican members of the House, saying: "Leave the schedule as it is; it is better for the election."

The Republicans now refuse to aid in putting raw materials on the free list, and certainly in New England free raw material has been considered as an element in protection almost as essential as the high tariff. From my business experience, in both importing and manufacturing I am fully aware of the necessity of protection for the maintenance of certain manufactures, and I very much regret that the Republican party, with which I have acted from its beginning, has, for political success, taken a position to the protection of our industries which is as bad as that of Massachusetts at that time. And that the condition of work-women in free-trade London to-day is far better than in high-protectionist Paris will be seen from the following extract from Helen Campbell's correspondence on the needle-women of Paris. She writes:

"The platform lecturer here an evening or two since on 'The Footprints of Wesley,' in speaking of his purchase from an English washerwoman of ships from the rock from which Wesley used to preach, and of his being told by her that the small sum received was more than she could get in England for a hard day's washing, brought out his continuing audience with the exclamation, 'How glad I am to find that the man who gave me this lecture has the same spirit as I have!'" whereas the lecturer and his hearers ought to have had the intelligence to know that the wages of English laborers, including English washwomen, are more than 50 per cent. higher in free trade Eng and, notwithstanding her denser population of over four hundred to a square mile, than in the high-protection country of continental Europe. The therefore, for the tariff is not the protection whatever of the higher wage rate of the American as compared with the English laborer, or the low wages of the English washwoman. Nay more, that the facts, if they prove anything, would show the tariff to be the cause of the lower wage rate in highly protected continental Europe, as compared with free-trade England, other conditions being vastly less dissimilar than between England and America, where its population even is but eight to ten times as large. One should know the condition of the English laboring class is vastly better now than under the high-tariff regime of forty years ago, in confirmation of which but read Miss Martineau's description of their condition at that time. And that the condition of work-women in free-trade London to-day is far better than in high-protectionist Paris will be seen from the following extract from Helen Campbell's correspondence on the needle-women of Paris. She writes:

"The average daily need is at the highest point, sugar alone being an illustration of what the determination to protect an industry has brought about. The London workwoman buys a pound for 1d., or at the most 2d. (2 cents and 4 cents). The French workwoman must give 11 or 12 sous (10 or 11 cents), and then have only beet sugar, which has not much over half the saccharine quality of cane sugar. Flour, meal, eggs, all are equally high, meat also being at nearly the same price as London. But is not the cost of living impossible, and fuel so dear that shivering is the law for all, but the rich, while rents are also beyond London prices. For the needlewoman the food question has resolved itself into bread alone for at least one meal, with a little coffee, chiefly chicory, and possibly some vegetables for the other. But many a one lives on bread for six days in a week, reserving the few sous that can be saved for a Sunday bit of meat or bones for soup."

And so on through a country as unfavorable to the manufacture of high-grade French goods as to the metropolis of that unfortunate (?) country in which prevails a "tariff for revenue only," and whose more highly paid laborers, strange as it may seem to the protectionist doctrinaire, find it unnecessary to demand protection from the low-paid or pauper wages of the competing nations of the continent. Strange, is it not, that American wages in the mind of your protectionist, need to be so highly protected,

into silence because they fear the power of monopoly trusts and combines to crush any honest industry that dares to compete with them.

There is not a woolen manufacturer in the United States who does not know that the Mills bill, with free wool, gives our woolen industry vastly better protection than the present tariff that extorts taxes consumers without protecting either capital or labor.

There is not a woolen manufacturer in the United States who does not know that with the Mills bill substituted for the present tariff the woolen industry would at once supply our whole home market instead of allowing Europe to supply within a small fraction of one-half of the wool we consume.

There is not a woolen manufacturer in the United States who does not know that with the Mills bill a law, our woolen employers would double their employment of home labor, pay labor better wages, pay larger profits to capital, and relieve the woolen consumers of the country—when we enter the whole people of at least \$120,000,000 annually for the necessities of life.

There is no protection to labor in taxing wool, while there is positive and practical protection to labor in taxing woolens; but they should not be taxed 68 per cent. and then give Europe half the labor of their production as is the case under the present tariff. (The profit on sheep east of the Missouri River is got from the mutton and from wool.)

The people want protection for home labor and they will gladly protect the woolen industry to enable it to supply its entire home market and pay liberal wages to labor; but they will not tax themselves 28 per cent. extra to protect wool that is not the product of labor and at the same time give European mills and foreign labor one-half our home market for woolens.—*Philadelphia Times.*

Tariff Views of Four Presidents.

FROM PRESIDENT GRANT'S MESSAGE OF 1875.

I would mention those articles which enter into manufactures of all sorts. All duty paid on such articles goes direct to the cost of the article which manufactured them. These duties not only come from the consumers at home, but act as a protection to foreign manufacturers in our own and distant markets.

FROM PRESIDENT ARTHUR'S MESSAGE OF 1884.

The present tariff system is in many respects unjust. It makes unequal distributions, both of its burdens and its benefits. * * * Without entering into minute details, which under present circumstances would be of little use, I can say that the tariff is not only unequal, but it is also unscientific. These duties not only come from the consumers at home, but act as a protection to foreign manufacturers in our own and distant markets.

FROM PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S MESSAGE OF 1887.

The taxation of luxuries presents no features

of hardship, but the necessities of life used and consumed by all the people, the duty upon which adds to the cost of living in every house, should be greatly cheapened. * * * Thus our people might have the opportunity of extending their sales beyond the limits of home consumption, living beyond the limits of home consumption, in business, and therefore by a glutted domestic market, and affording their employees more certain and steady labor, with the resulting quiet and contentment.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD'S SPEECH IN THE HOUSE IN 1878.

I believe that we ought to seek that point of stable equilibrium somewhere between a prohibitory tariff on one hand and a tariff that gives no protection on the other. What's that point of equilibrium? In my judgment it is this: A rate so high that the manufacturers cannot flood our markets and break down our home manufacturers, but not so high as to keep them altogether out, enabling our manufacturers to combine and raise the prices, or so high as to stimulate an unwholesome growth of manufactures. In other words, I would have the duty so adjusted that every great American industry can fairly live and make fair profits; and yet so adjusted that if a manufacturer attempted to put prices unreasonably the competition from abroad would come in and bring down prices to a fair rate.

Where the Workingmen Stand.

Congressman Lawler, who voted against the Morrison bill two years ago, has been telling the Eastern people how he came to vote for the Mills bill. He says: "I have not heard one word of complaint from any of my constituents since the Mills bill was passed, and I have been in receipt of letters and telegrams from my constituents urging me to support it. In nearly every case these communications were sent by Knights of Labor and others who at one time believed that the prosperity depended upon a continuance of the existing tariff system."

Mr. Lawler further informs the Eastern people that 90 per cent. of his constituents are in favor of the tariff, and that he represents one of the largest manufacturing districts in the West.

"The passage of the bill," he says, "will make us vote instead of weakening us."

So much for the free-trade cry in Chicago. The only labor member of the House, Congressman Smith, of Milwaukee, voted for the Mills bill, although like Congressman Lawler, his political existence depends on the good opinion of the workingmen. The labor organizations throughout the West, and, perhaps, throughout the country are more favorable to a reduction of the tariff than are to the Republican ultra protection platform.

The farming classes are the hope of the Republicans in this campaign as in the past. Still, the farmers are not protected. They have to fight their own battles. They buy their farm